

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Douglas Bauman,  
  
Plaintiff  
  
v.  
  
Nevada Dept of Corrections, et al.,  
  
Defendants

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00109-JAD-VCF

**Order Dismissing Case**

Plaintiff Douglas Bauman brings this civil-rights case under § 1983 for events he alleges occurred during his incarceration. On January 15, 2019, I ordered Bauman to file an updated address with the court by February 15, 2019.<sup>1</sup> I expressly warned him that his failure to timely comply with the order would result in the dismissal of this case.<sup>2</sup> The deadline has passed, and Bauman has not filed an updated address, so I dismiss this case.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.<sup>3</sup> A court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.<sup>4</sup> In determining whether to

---

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 3 (order).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

<sup>4</sup> *See Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

1 dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with  
2 local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious  
3 resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the  
4 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the  
5 availability of less drastic alternatives.<sup>5</sup>

6 I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the  
7 litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case.  
8 The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury  
9 arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or  
10 prosecuting an action.<sup>6</sup> The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of  
11 dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in  
12 dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.<sup>7</sup> Bauman was warned that his  
13 case would be dismissed without prejudice if he failed to update his address by February 15,  
14 2019.<sup>6</sup> So, Bauman had adequate warning that his failure to update his address would result in  
15 this case's dismissal.

16 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** without  
17 prejudice based on Bauman's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this court's  
18 January 15, 2019, order; and

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

---

22  
23 <sup>5</sup> *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;  
24 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

25 <sup>6</sup> *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

26 <sup>7</sup> *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

27 <sup>6</sup> ECF No. 3 (order).  
28

1 The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS  
2 CASE.

3 DATED: February 22, 2019

4   
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey